In the Drawings:

Submitted herewith for the Examiner's approval is a proposed amendment to drawing Fig. 4B. The proposed amendments to the drawing figure is indicated thereon in red ink. The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the proposed drawing changes. Upon approval, Applicants will file new drawings that include these changes.

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 13, 15, 16, and 21-56 were examined. Claims 37-45 and 56 were allowed and claims 1-7, 13, 15, 16, 21-36, and 46-55 were rejected. Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has allowed claims 37-45 and 56. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 23-36 and 46-55. In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

Drawings

The Applicants are submitting a proposed drawing amendment to Fig. 4B as suggested by the Examiner.

Double Patenting

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 13, 15, 16, 21, and 22 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,431. The Examiner stated that a timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome a nonstatutory double patenting ground. Applicants will submit a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR

1.321(c) upon allowance of the present application but are not submitting a terminal disclaimer at this time. Applicants also note that the present application is a continuation of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,431.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 23, 24, 46-51, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Huang et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,748,904), hereinafter Huang. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 23, 24, 46-51, and 55.

The Examiner indicates that Huang discloses computing a set of codewords from the set of original colors, computing a set of computed colors using the set of codewords, and mapping each original color to one of the computed colors to produce an index for each original color. Huang discloses a system for compressing graphic data where each segment of graphic data is compressed using three different algorithms that encode the graphic data as a plurality of codewords (abstract). The codeword that compresses the largest number of pixels is selected as the compressed data and stored in a buffer (col. 3, lines 34-58).

Huang, however, does not teach or suggest computing a set of computed colors using the set of codewords, as required in claim 23. Rather, in Huang, after codewords are generated using the different algorithms and a codeword is selected from among these codewords, compression of the graphics data is completed (col. 3, lines 60-67). As such, Huang does not teach or suggest computing a set of computed colors using the set of codewords and does not anticipate claim 23. Therefore, Applicants believe claim 23 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 24 is dependent upon claim 23 and therefore also in allowable form for at least the same reasons as claim 23.

Claim 46 recites a method for decoding an encoded image block and contains the "computing a computed color" limitation of claim 23. Therefore, claim 46 is also in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 23. Claims 47-49 are dependent on claim 46 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 46. Claim 49 also requires mapping an index to a second computed color. This limitation of claim 49 is also not taught by Huang since Huang does not disclose computing a computed color (as discussed above) or mapping an index to a computed color.

Claim 50 recites a method for decoding an encoded image block and contains the "computing a computed color" limitation of claim 23. Therefore, claim 50 is also in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 23. In addition, claim 50 requires mapping a set of indices to a first computed color if a block type indicates a three color encoded image block, and mapping a set of indices to a first and second computed colors if a block type indicates a four color encoded image block. Huang does not teach or suggest mapping a set of indices to a certain number of computed colors depending on a block type being a three or four color encoded image block, as required in claim 50. Therefore, claim 50 is allowable for this reason as well.

Claim 51 is dependent on claim 50 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 50.

Claim 55 recites a computer program product comprising program elements and contains the "computing a computed color" limitation of claim 23. Therefore, claim 55 is also in condition for allowance for the same reasons as claim 23.

35 U.S.C. 103 (a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 25-36 and 52-54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Normile et al. (U.S. Patent 5,822,465), hereinafter Normile.

The Examiner indicated that Normile teaches a set of original colors being defined according to a selected color space and computing a set of computed colors using a set of codewords to select a set of parameters in the selected color space from which the set of computed colors may be obtained. The Examiner cited column 11, lines 13-15 and column 11, lines 27-34 of Normile. Although Normile discloses a vector quantizer used to build a codebook for the compression of data where an image can be reconstructed using the generated codebook (col. 5, lines 23-31), Normile does not teach or suggest the limitations indicated by the Examiner. In particular, the portions of Normile cited by the Examiner do not relate to a method or apparatus of data compression but refer to a preprocessor that transforms an RGB color space to a YUV color space *prior to* data compression by the vector quantizer (col. 5, lines 43-48 and col. 11, lines 35-42). As such, Normile does not teach or suggest a method of compression whereby a set of computed colors is computed using a set of codewords to select a set of parameters in the selected color space from which the set of computed colors may be obtained, as required in claim 25. Rather, in Normile, a selected color space format is transformed to another color space format prior to data compression. Therefore, claim 25 is patentable over Huang in view of Normile and in condition for allowance.

Claims 26-36 are dependent on claim 25 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 25. In addition, Normile does not teach or suggest a set of parameters defining a curve, line, plane, or geometric element in the color space, as required in claim 27, claim 28, claim 29,

and claim 30, respectively. Therefore, claims 27-30 are patentable over Huang in view of Normile for these reasons as well.

Claims 52-54 are dependent on claim 50 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 50.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that the rejections in the Office Action of September 9, 2002 are fully overcome and that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Konstantine I. Iourcha et al.

Date: 12/4/02

By: Susan Yee

Susan Yee, Reg. No. 41,388
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2225 East Bayshore Road, Suite 200
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone: (650) 812-3400
Fax: (650) 812-3444